



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/821,603

04/09/2004

David B. Cross

MS1-1973US

1564

22801 7590 12/02/2009
LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2431

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/02/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/821,603	Applicant(s) CROSS ET AL.	
	Examiner MATTHEW T. HENNING	Art Unit 2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27, 29, 32, 33, 35-44, 48 and 49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27, 29, 32, 33, 35-44, 48 and 49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1 This action is in response to the communication filed on 7/15/2009.

2 **DETAILED ACTION**

3 ***Response to Arguments***

4 Applicant's arguments filed 6/4/2009 have been fully considered but are moot in view of
5 the new grounds of rejection presented below. The newly claimed limitations have been
6 addressed accordingly below.

7 All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

8 Claims 1-27,29,32,33,35-44,48 and 49 have been examined.

9 ***Information Disclosure Statement***

10 The information disclosure statement(s) (IDS) submitted on 7/29/2009 and 9/8/2009 are
11 in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the
12 information disclosure statements.

13 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
15 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

16 *A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or*
17 *described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter*
18 *sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have*
19 *been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to*
20 *which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which*
21 *the invention was made.*
22

23 Claims 1-2, 4-16, 33, 35-44, and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
24 unpatentable over Burch et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2005/0171872) hereinafter
25 referred to as Burch, and further in view of Brovick et al. ("WINDOWS® 2000 Active

1 Directory™”) hereinafter referred to as Brovick, and further in view of Rao et al. (US Patent
2 Number 5,689,706) hereinafter referred to as Rao.

3 Regarding claim 1, Burch disclosed a method comprising: storing, in a memory,
4 instructions for performing the method; executing the instructions on a processor; according to
5 the instructions being executed: receiving a first event notification (See Burch Paragraph 0043);
6 evaluating the local credentials and the remote credentials (Burch Paragraphs 0039-0040) and
7 synchronizing the local credentials and remote credentials (See Burch Paragraph 0043-0044), but
8 Burch failed to specifically disclose enumerating local credentials and remote credentials in
9 response to the event notification, that the evaluation was based on the enumerating, or wherein
10 the event notification comprises a lock event. Burch did, however, disclose that the credential
11 stores are directories (See Burch Paragraph 0022).

12 Brovick teaches that Active Directory is a directory service, which provided replication
13 of data between devices, as well as synchronization of the data between the devices in an Active
14 Directory (See Brovick First Paragraph), and that in order to maintain synchronization between
15 each copy of the directory, each update to a directory is provided with a USN which is compared
16 with USNs in other devices to determine which updates need to be replicated (See Brovick
17 "Keeping Track").

18 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
19 invention to employ the teachings of Brovick in the credential store system of Burch by utilizing
20 Active Directory to provided the directory service and the synchronization between the
21 credential stores. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art at

1 the time of invention would have been motivated to provide quick and efficient directory
2 services across the distributed credential store.

3 Rao teaches that in a synchronization system, the operating system can perform a lock
4 function on the replicated data in order to prevent changes to the data during the synchronization
5 (Rao Col. 16 Line 54 – Col. 17 Line 4).

6 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
7 invention to have employed the teachings of Rao in the system of Brovick by performing the
8 synchronization in response to locking the data. This would have been obvious because the
9 ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to prevent the data from being
10 altered during the synchronization operation.

11 Regarding claim 33, Burch disclosed a system comprising: an event handler to receive
12 event notifications (See Burch Paragraph 0043-0044); and a synchronizing module operatively
13 associated with the event handler to synchronize local credentials and remote credentials if the
14 local and remote credentials are different from one another (See Burch Paragraph 0043-0044),
15 but Burch failed to specifically disclose enumerating local credentials and remote credentials in
16 response to the event notification, or wherein the event notification is at least one of the
17 following: a lock event, and an unlock event. Burch did, however, disclose that the credential
18 stores are directories (See Burch Paragraph 0022).

19 Brovick teaches that Active Directory is a directory service, which provided replication
20 of data between devices, as well as synchronization of the data between the devices in an Active
21 Directory (See Brovick First Paragraph), and that in order to maintain synchronization between
22 each copy of the directory, each update to a directory is provided with a USN which is compared

1 with USNs in other devices to determine which updates need to be replicated (See Brovick
2 "Keeping Track").

3 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
4 invention to employ the teachings of Brovick in the credential store system of Burch by utilizing
5 Active Directory to provided the directory service and the synchronization between the
6 credential stores. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art at
7 the time of invention would have been motivated to provide quick and efficient directory
8 services across the distributed credential store.

9 Rao teaches that in a synchronization system, the operating system can perform a lock
10 function on the replicated data in order to prevent changes to the data during the synchronization
11 (Rao Col. 16 Line 54 – Col. 17 Line 4).

12 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
13 invention to have employed the teachings of Rao in the system of Brovick by performing the
14 synchronization in response to locking the data. This would have been obvious because the
15 ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to prevent the data from being
16 altered during the synchronization operation.

17
18 Regarding claim 2, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that synchronizing the local
19 credentials and the remote credentials is based on at least one time-stamp associated with the
20 local credentials and at least one time-stamp associated with the remote credentials (See Brovick
21 Conflict Resolution).

1 Regarding claim 4, while Burch, Brovick, and Rao did not specifically teach that the
2 synchronizing included error handling, it was well known in the art of data transmission to
3 include error handling, and therefore would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in
4 the art at the time of invention to have done so.

5 Regarding claim 5, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught writing at least one of the local
6 credentials to a remote credential cache (See Burch Paragraph 0056).

7 Regarding claim 6, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught writing at least one of the remote
8 credentials to a local credential cache (See Burch Paragraph 0053).

9 Regarding claims 7-8, while Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that changes in local
10 credentials are duplicated in the remote credential store, and vice versa, they failed to specifically
11 disclose deleting remote credentials. However, addition and deletion of credentials in a
12 credential store is well known, and would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the
13 art at the time of invention. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in
14 the art would have been motivated to have allowed flexibility in the authorizations granted
15 within the system by allowing authorizations to be granted and taken away.

16 Regarding claim 9, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught modifying at least one of the local
17 credentials at a local credential cache based on at least one of the remote credentials (See Burch
18 Paragraph 0053).

19 Regarding claim 10, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught modifying at least one of the remote
20 credentials at a remote credential cache based on at least one of the local credentials See Burch
21 Paragraph 0056).

1 Regarding claim 11, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught updating a list of local credentials
2 (See Brovick "Keeping Track").

3 Regarding claim 12, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught updating a list of remote credentials
4 (See Brovick "Keeping Track").

5 Regarding claim 13, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught determining a state of the remote
6 credentials dynamically (See Brovick "Intra-Site Replication" and "Inter-Site Replication").

7 Regarding claim 14, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught maintaining a state file for the
8 remote credentials (See Brovick "Keeping Track").

9 Regarding claim 15, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught maintaining a state file for the local
10 credentials (See Brovick "Keeping Track").

11 Regarding claim 16, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught resolving a conflict of state between
12 the local credentials and the remote credentials (See Burch Paragraph 0044 and Brovick
13 "Conflict Resolution").

14 Regarding claim 35, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that the credentials include at least
15 one of the following: an encryption credential, a token, an asymmetric key pair, a symmetric key,
16 a digital certificate, an XrML license, an authentication credential, an authorization credential
17 (See Burch Paragraphs 0022-0024).

18 Regarding claim 36, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that a local store manager to
19 enumerate the local credentials for the synchronizing module (See Brovick "Keeping Track").

20 Regarding claim 37, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that a remote store manager to
21 enumerate the remote credentials for the synchronizing module (See Brovick "Keeping Track").

1 Regarding claim 38, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that the local credentials are stored
2 in a local cache (See Burch Paragraph 0053).

3 Regarding claim 39, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that the local credentials are stored
4 in a local cache provided at any number (n) of clients (See Burch Paragraph 0053).

5 Regarding claim 40, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that the local credentials are
6 encrypted using a master key (See Burch Paragraph 0025).

7 Regarding claim 41, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that the remote credentials are
8 stored in a remote cache (See Burch Paragraph 0056).

9 Regarding claim 42, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that the local credentials are stored
10 in a remote cache provided at any number (n) of hosts (see Burch Paragraph 0056).

11 Regarding claim 43, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that the remote credentials are
12 maintained by a remote directory service (See Burch Paragraphs 0022 and 0056).

13 Regarding claim 44, Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught that the remote credentials are
14 encrypted (See Burch Paragraph 0025).

15 Regarding claims 48-49, while Burch, Brovick, and Rao taught enumerating the local
16 credentials and remote credentials in response to receiving an event notification (See the
17 rejection of claim 1 above), they failed to specifically teach that the enumeration is performed in
18 response to all of the following events: a startup event, a shutdown event, a logon event, a logoff
19 event, an unlock event, a timer event, a manual request, a credential update event; and in
20 response to at least one of a policy update, running a process, and connecting to a network.
21 However, all of these events were known events which can trigger synchronization at the time of

1 the invention, and as such, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at
2 the time of invention to have included them as trigger events in the system of Burch.

3 Claims 17, 18, 20-27, 29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
4 unpatentable over Burch, and further in view of Brovick, and further in view of Heinrich et al.
5 (US Patent Number 6,510,522) hereinafter referred to as Heinrich.

6
7 Regarding claim 17, Burch disclosed a method comprising: receiving an event
8 notification (See Burch Paragraph 0043); and synchronizing the local credentials and remote
9 credentials (See Burch Paragraph 0043-0044) and changing at least one of the local credentials in
10 a first local credential cache (Burch Paragraphs 0043-0044) wherein the credential comprises at
11 least one of the following: a token (Burch Certificate), and an XrML license, but Burch failed to
12 specifically disclose enumerating local credentials and remote credentials in response to the
13 event notification. Burch did, however, disclose that the credential stores are directories (See
14 Burch Paragraph 0022).

15 Burch further failed to disclose a synchronization module which: sorts the local
16 credentials and the remote credentials into a local credential array and a remote credential array
17 respectively and linearly compares the local credential array and the remote credential array; and
18 stores a state file for conflict resolution, the state file comprising: a file version; a flag, wherein
19 the flag indicates whether the credential is user protected (but Burch did disclose that some
20 credentials are user protected in Paragraph 0055); and a credential state, wherein the credential
21 state comprises: last time synchronization module called; last time local store changed; and last
22 time remote cache changed.

1 Burch further failed to disclose that the change to the first local credential was removal
2 from the cache associated with a first device based upon the synchronizing module comparing
3 the local credential array and the remote credential array, wherein the credential removed from
4 the first local credential cache is identified and tagged by the synchronization module in a remote
5 credential cache; and based on the synchronizing module comparing the local credential array
6 and the remote credential array, removing the tagged credential from a second local credential
7 cache associated with a second device, wherein the first device is different than the second
8 device, without rewriting the tagged credential to the remote credential cache. However,
9 addition and deletion of credentials in a credential store was well known in the art at the time of
10 invention, and would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
11 invention. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would
12 have been motivated to have allowed flexibility in the authorizations granted within the system
13 by allowing authorizations to be granted and taken away.

14
15 Brovick teaches that Active Directory is a directory service, which provided replication
16 of data between devices, as well as synchronization of the data between the devices in an Active
17 Directory (See Brovick First Paragraph), and that in order to maintain synchronization between
18 each copy of the directory, each update to a directory is provided with a USN which is compared
19 with USNs in other devices to determine which updates need to be replicated (See Brovick
20 "Keeping Track"). Brovick further teaches keeping track of timestamps of when the local and
21 remote (replicated) data was updated (See Brovick "Conflict Resolution"), and when
22 synchronization was last performed (See Brovick "Intra-Site Replication"). Brovick further

1 teaches that when a change in one local cache is made, the domain controller will mark the
2 change in an up-to-date vector, and then replicate the change in other caches throughout the
3 network without undoing the change (Brovick "Keeping Track").

4 Further, it was well known in the art at the time of invention to sort data into arrays for
5 linear comparison in order to ease the complexity of the comparison, as well as to use flags to
6 track Boolean properties.

7 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
8 invention to employ the teachings of Brovick in the credential store system of Burch by utilizing
9 Active Directory to provided the directory service and the synchronization between the
10 credential stores. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art at
11 the time of invention would have been motivated to provide quick and efficient directory
12 services across the distributed credential store. It further would have been obvious to the
13 ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to have sorted the local and remote
14 credentials into a local and remote credential array, and then linearly comparing the arrays to
15 determine conflicts which need to be resolved. This would have been obvious because ordinary
16 person skilled in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to ease the
17 complexity of the comparison for determining conflicts between the servers. In this
18 combination, the USN reads on the claimed version number. Further still, it would have been
19 obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to have stored a flag for
20 each entry in the credential store to track whether the entry was personal (user protected) or not.
21 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
22 motivated to utilize a well known method for tracking Boolean properties to track the Boolean

1 property of personal entry or not. Even further still, it would have been obvious to the ordinary
2 person skilled in the art at the time of invention to have employed the teachings of Brovick in the
3 synchronization system by marking the deletion of a credential from the cache, and propagating
4 the change to the other caches in the network. This would have been obvious because the
5 ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to synchronize the caches.

6 Burch further failed to disclose that the event notification comprised an unlock event.

7 Heinrich teaches that credentials can be protected from alteration by locking access to the
8 memory locations containing the credentials, and that upon unlocking the memory the
9 credentials can be updated (Heinrich Abstract).

10 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
11 invention to have employed the teachings of Heinrich in the system of Brovick by locking and
12 unlocking the memory locations holding the credentials, and performing the synchronization in
13 response to unlocking. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the
14 art would have been motivated to prevent the data from being altered outside of the update and
15 synchronization operations.

16 Further still, Brovick failed to specifically disclose handling errors, wherein error
17 handling comprises returning a write state indication of a status of a credential write operation,
18 wherein the write state indication consists of one of the following: a none indication, wherein the
19 none indication comprises an indication that the credential was not altered; a partial indication,
20 wherein the partial indication comprises an indication that the credential was partially altered; or
21 a done indication, wherein the done indication comprises an indication that the credential was
22 successfully changed. However, it was well known in the art of data transmission and

1 synchronization at the time of invention to provide an acknowledgement of successful
2 synchronization in the event that the synchronization of the data was completed successfully. As
3 such, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention
4 to have employed ACKs and NACKs of successful completion of synchronization. This would
5 have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to
6 ensure the synchronization operation was successful.

7 Regarding claim 18, Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich taught that synchronizing the local
8 credentials and the remote credentials is based on at least one time-stamp associated with the
9 local credentials and at least one time-stamp associated with the remote credentials (See Brovick
10 Conflict Resolution).

11 Regarding claim 20, Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich taught writing at least one of the local
12 credentials to a remote credential cache (See Burch Paragraph 0056).

13 Regarding claim 21, Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich taught writing at least one of the
14 remote credentials to a local credential cache (See Burch Paragraph 0053).

15 Regarding claims 22-23, while Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich taught that changes in local
16 credentials are duplicated in the remote credential store, and vice versa, they failed to specifically
17 disclose deleting remote credentials. However, addition and deletion of credentials in a
18 credential store is well known, and would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the
19 art at the time of invention. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in
20 the art would have been motivated to have allowed flexibility in the authorizations granted
21 within the system by allowing authorizations to be granted and taken away.

1 Regarding claim 24, Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich taught modifying at least one of the
2 local credentials at a local credential cache based on at least one of the remote credentials (See
3 Burch Paragraph 0053).

4 Regarding claim 25, Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich taught modifying at least one of the
5 remote credentials at a remote credential cache based on at least one of the local credentials See
6 Burch Paragraph 0056).

7 Regarding claim 26, Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich taught updating a list of local
8 credentials (See Brovick "Keeping Track").

9 Regarding claim 27, Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich taught updating a list of remote
10 credentials (See Brovick "Keeping Track").

11 Regarding claim 29, Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich taught determining a state of the
12 remote credentials dynamically (See Brovick "Intra-Site Replication" and "Inter-Site
13 Replication").

14 Regarding claim 32, Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich taught resolving a conflict of state
15 between the local credentials and the remote credentials (See Burch Paragraph 0044 and Brovick
16 "Conflict Resolution").

17
18 Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination
19 of Burch, Brovick, and Rao as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Yianilos et al. (US
20 Patent Application Publication 2002/0029214) hereinafter referred to as Yianilos.

1 Burch, Brovick, and Rao disclosed detection of changes between local and remote
2 credentials, but failed to disclose that the synchronizing was based on a comparison of hash
3 values.

4 Yianilos teaches an alternative method for detecting differences between entries in a
5 synchronization system which involves generating a hash for the local data and a hash for the
6 remote data, and comparing the hashes, wherein if the hashes are different then a change has
7 been detected and synchronization is required (See Yianilos Paragraphs 0083 – 0084).

8 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
9 invention to employ the teachings of Yianilos in the synchronization system of Burch, Brovick,
10 and Rao by detecting changes by comparing hashes of the local and remote credential stores.
11 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
12 motivated to minimize the network traffic generated by the synchronization.

13 Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination
14 of Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Yianilos et al. (US
15 Patent Application Publication 2002/0029214) hereinafter referred to as Yianilos.

16 Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich disclosed detection of changes between local and remote
17 credentials, but failed to disclose that the synchronizing was based on a comparison of hash
18 values.

19 Yianilos teaches an alternative method for detecting differences between entries in a
20 synchronization system which involves generating a hash for the local data and a hash for the
21 remote data, and comparing the hashes, wherein if the hashes are different then a change has
22 been detected and synchronization is required (See Yianilos Paragraphs 0083 – 0084).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Yianilos in the synchronization system of Burch, Brovick, and Heinrich by detecting changes by comparing hashes of the local and remote credential stores. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to minimize the network traffic generated by the synchronization.

Conclusion

Claims 1-27,29,32,33,35-44,48 and 49 have been rejected.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW T. HENNING whose telephone number is (571)272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

Art Unit: 2431

1 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
2 supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571)272-7589. The fax phone number for the
3 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

4 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
5 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
6 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
7 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
8 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
9 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would
10 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated
11 information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

12
13
14 /Matthew T Henning/
15 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431
16